

## REMARKS

Except as explained below, Applicants are amending the claims to correct informalities therein. These amendments are not in response to a patentability rejection and add no new matter. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these amendments be entered.

Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

#### Claims 13, 16, 17, 20, 21, 24, 53-55 and 60-62

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 13, 16, 17, 20, 21, 24, 53-55 and 60-62 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al. (US 6,362,507) in view of Jacobson et al. (US 6,294,401). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 13, 17 and 21 to recite the features of performing a heat treatment by a lamp or a laser beam and planarizing the gate electrode(s), the source and drain wirings and the pixel electrode(s). These features are supported by, for example, page 22, ln. 8 - page 23, ln. 6 and Fig. 7D of the present application. As explained on page 22, lns. 15-19 of the specification, the unevenness of the gate electrode(s), the source and drain wirings and the pixel electrode(s) can be eliminated by the claimed planarizing, and as a result of creating this planarized surface, it is easier to form the insulating film over the gate electrode(s), the source and drain wirings and the pixel electrode(s).

Neither Ogawa nor Jacobson appear to disclose or suggest the above-claimed features. Therefore, even if it were proper to combine these references (which Applicants do not admit), such

combination would still not disclose or suggest the method of independent Claims 13, 17 and 21. Accordingly, independent Claims 13, 17 and 21 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 14, 15, 18, 19, 22 and 23

The Examiner also rejects Claims 14, 15, 18, 19, 22 and 23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al. in view of Jacobson et al. and further in view of Speakman (US 6,713,389). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 25, 28-32, 35-39, 42-46, 49-52, 56-59 and 63-66

The Examiner also rejects Claims 25, 28-32, 35-39, 42-46, 49-52, 56-59 and 63-66 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. (JP 2001-052864) in view of Jacobson et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection in order to advance the prosecution of this application, independent Claims 25, 32, 39 and 46 have been amended. Amended independent Claims 25, 32, 39 and 46 recite similar features to those discussed above for independent Claims 13, 17 and 21.

Neither Yamazaki nor Jacobson appear to disclose or suggest the above-claimed features. Therefore, even if it were proper to combine these references (which Applicants do not admit), such combination would still not disclose or suggest the method of independent Claims 25, 32, 39 and 46.

Accordingly, independent Claims 25, 32, 39 and 46 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 26, 27, 33, 34, 40, 41, 47 and 48

The Examiner also rejects Claims 26, 27, 33, 34, 40, 41, 47 and 48 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. in view of Jacobson et al. and further in view of Speakman. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants are also adding new dependent Claims 67-73. Each of these claims is allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed.

If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Title

Applicants are also amending the title to better describe the claimed invention. It is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered and allowed.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and


should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our Deposit Account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 30, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
200 West Adams Street  
Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 26568